DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 220 IR 051 067

AUTHOR Olsen, Jan Kennedy; And Others
TITLE Cornell University Libraries. A Final Report from the Public Services Research Projects. Appropriate Public Services for Agricultural Research Faculty. One of a Series of Self-Studies and Research Projects.
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.; Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. Univ. Libraries
SPONS AGENCY General Electric Foundation, Ossining, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jan 85
NOTE 60p.; For related documents, see IR 051 066-074.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036 ($15.00 per copy, prepaid).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Agriculture; Higher Education; Library Administration; Library Collection Development; *Library Planning; Library Research; *Library Role; *Library Services; Position Papers; Research Libraries; Research Tools; Scientific and Technical Information; Self Evaluation (Groups); User Satisfaction (Information)
IDENTIFIERS *Cornell University NY

ABSTRACT

This paper reports a self-study undertaken at Cornell University's Albert R. Mann Library to explore appropriate public services for an agricultural research faculty. The study took place over a 22-month period and involved a literature review, development of a questionnaire, administration of the questionnaire, an experimental period of additional and free services, a second administration of the questionnaire, analysis of the survey results, and a final report. Using a panel study technique, pre- and post-questionnaires were sent to a random sample of 50% of the 470-member College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS) staff to measure faculty attitudes toward current and proposed library services. In the intervening period, expanded and free services were offered. In this report, the role of the library in the scientific research process is examined, a ranking of important library services is presented, and a model of appropriate public services for agricultural research faculty is proposed. The pre- and post-questionnaires with tabulated results, publicity and advertising materials, and record keeping forms are appended. (Author/THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 232-8656

PUBLIC SERVICES IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

FINAL REPORT FROM
THE PUBLIC SERVICES RESEARCH PROJECTS

Cornell University

Project sponsored by the General Electric Foundation

Office of Management Studies
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.
January, 1985

PUBLIC SERVICES IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES
RESEARCH PROJECTS

Seven Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members conducted research on current public services concerns, as part of a Public Services in Research Libraries Project sponsored by the General Electric Foundation and operated by ARL's Office of Management Studies.

Research grants of up to $4,000 were provided for the projects, which were selected in part because of their potential usefulness to academic and research libraries. The subjects include the integration of online catalogs into public services, identification of the unique instructional and research needs of students and faculty in particular disciplines, and the impact of technology on both library users and staff members.

The Public Services in Research Libraries Project was financed by a $250,000 two-year grant from the General Electric Foundation. Now, the Office of Management Studies is offering academic libraries a series of aids to analyze, improve, and adapt their public services programs to changing economic, technological, and user needs. The aids include an assisted self-study process and training activities to benefit public services staff.

Additional copies of this report are available for $15.00 -- prepayment required -- from OMS, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Make check payable to "ARL Office of Management Studies." Outside the U.S. and Canada, add $5.00 postage and handling.

Appropriate Public Services for Agricultural Research Faculty

Final Report

Albert R. Mann Library
Cornell University

Jan Kennedy Olsen, Director Mann Library
Joan K. Lippincott, ARL Project Director
Bill Coons, ARL Project Manager

Office of Management Studies
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.
January, 1985

Appropriate Public Services for Agricultural Research Faculty

Albert R. Mann Library
Cornell University
Jan Kennedy Olsen, Director, Mann Library
Joan K. Lippincott, ARL Project Director
Bill Coons, ARL Project Manager

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study designed to explore appropriate public services for agricultural research faculty. The hypothesis was that if library services were made more convenient and accessible, faculty would change their information resource use pattern. At the Albert R. Mann Library, Cornell University, a pre and post questionnaire were distributed to measure faculty attitudes towards current and proposed library services. In the intervening period, expanded and free services were offered. In this report, the role of the library in the scientific research process is examined, a ranking of important library services is presented, and a model of appropriate public services for agricultural research faculty is proposed.

INTRODUCTION

Librarians in academic research libraries must constantly re-examine their mission and the role they play in the institutions they serve. Much attention has been given in recent years to the librarian's role in the instructional process, i.e. bibliographic instruction, but less attention has been paid to their role in the research process. Few studies exist which demonstrate the importance of library services or librarians's skills to the faculty's research endeavors. In many universities, faculty research is at least as important a component of the university's mission as instructional goals. Academic librarians need to evaluate systematically the information needs of researchers in the disciplines they serve and develop models of services to meet those needs.

The grant that the Albert R. Mann Library received from the Association of Research Libraries was for the purpose of studying the information resource use pattern of faculty in the agricultural sciences. The hypothesis was that faculty seem to underutilize information resources in their research. They express concern about keeping up with the prolific number and variety of resources available. If library services were made more convenient and accessible, more like those of a special library, faculty would change their information resource use pattern. As an end result, which we did not attempt to measure in this study, it was hoped that the quality of agricultural research would benefit.

The components of the study were an initial survey of faculty concerning their use of information resources followed by a period of expanded and accessible services. At the end of the trial period, faculty were re-surveyed to evaluate the services and to measure whether their pattern of use of library resources had changed. A model of the kinds of services required by an agricultural research faculty was developed.

The key personnel in this study were: Jan Kennedy Olsen, Director of Mann Library, who provided the original ideas for the study, the conceptual framework for the project, and the financial and moral support needed to carry through the endeavor; Joan K. Lippincott, Head of Public Services at Mann Library, who coordinated staff involvement and provided guidance for overall activities; Bill Coons, Reference Librarian at Mann Library, who directed the day-to-day activities of the project and consolidated the questionnaires. In addition, James J. Zuiches, Associate Director of Research, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University and J. Paul Yarbrough, Professor of Communication Arts, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University, served as consultants on methodology and survey design; Jay Hilfiger, Manager of Statistical Computing and Phil Dixon, both of Cornell Computer Services, assisted with data analysis.

In order to understand why a study of this type was undertaken at Cornell, it is important to have some background on the nature of the institution. The Albert R. Mann Library, a state-supported unit of Cornell University, serves the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the College of Human Ecology, the Division of Biological Sciences, and the Division of Nutritional Sciences. As the land-grant university for New York State, Cornell has a top-rated program in the agricultural sciences. With its collection of over 550,000 volumes, Mann is the largest academic agricultural library in the U.S. and the second largest library on the Cornell campus. Cornell is predominantly a research institution and has produced Nobel laureates and internationally-known experts in the sciences. This study focused on the faculty of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS), which includes 470 faculty in such diverse departments as Agricultural Economics and Animal Science. An important aspect of CALS's mission is to conduct research and disseminate the results to both the scientific community and the practicing farmer. The college has a highly developed research program; in 1982-3, over $40 million was spent in support of 792 research projects.

Several key factors furnished the rationale for this study. First, the general, undocumented observation that faculty are under-served in academic libraries provided a basis for concern. In a premier research institution, library service for faculty should add significantly to the research process. Second, few studies exist which measure faculty response to proposed services as well as existing services. As traditional modes of information retrieval change and some become obsolete, it is important that faculty are aware that librarians are willing and able to adapt their practices to new technology and can find creative solutions to deal with the information explosion. Third, some faculty may wish to change who performs some of their library tasks for them; library staff may be able to provide more efficient services than departmental assistants. Fourth, if the library is seen as indispensable by the faculty, it will have a powerful and influential lobbying group who will assist in funding new

services. Fifth, in studying faculty response to new services during a trial period and in measuring attitudes and needs by means of a questionnaire, a model of services would be developed. The thirty-one other land-grant libraries in the Association of Research Libraries should be able to benefit from the model of services developed as a result of this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review focused on 1) the process of scientific communication, with emphasis on modes of information-gathering by agricultural researchers, 2) models of information services and/or new roles for librarians in the information age, and 3) examples of questionnaires and survey techniques.

A recent monograph by Busch and Lacy provided valuable insight into the research profile of agricultural scientists working in academia. While their study focused on the broader research process and pattern of scientific communication, they included several useful questions on the role of the library (Busch and Lacy, 1983). A study by Ching-Chih Chen examined physicists' use of libraries and other sources of information (Chen, 1974). A potentially useful paper on the information needs of agriculturalists focused little attention on the needs of agricultural researchers and instead emphasized concerns of agricultural producers (Russell, 1983).

Among recent studies of new roles for libraries and librarians, that by Nina Matheson stands out (Matheson, 1982). In fact, two other articles written that year concur with Matheson's call for the librarian to take a greater role in information management and form closer ties with researchers (Drake, 1982, Horton, 1982).

While many studies have been made of existing library services, few studies describe evaluations of new information services offered to faculty or researchers in academic institutions. However, two interesting studies provided perspective for our project; one instituted personalized services for a lab at a university, another established a manual current awareness service for social science researchers (Holladay, 1982; Evans and Line, 1973).

In planning the survey design and nature of services to be evaluated and offered, a number of sources were consulted. They included a discussion of the process of planning a user study (Butler and Gratch, 1982) and a detailed monograph on a user survey in two academic libraries (Dougherty and Blomquist, 1974). An earlier survey of faculty use of the Cornell libraries was consulted (Gautschi, 1980). Several sources were used to assist with design of our questionnaire and development of specific questions (Payne, 1951; Dillman, 1978; User Surveys, 1981; Weisberg and Bowen, 1977).

OBJECTIVES

The nature of this study was rather broad and a number of interrelated issues were examined. One overall objective was to determine how the

library fits into the process of scientific communication. Specifically, what is the library's role in the academic scientist's research/information gathering process? If librarians better understood how they could tailor services to meet these researchers' needs, would it lead to more use of services and would it change researchers' opinions of the importance of the library's role?

As an end product of this study, we wanted to construct a model of appropriate information services for agricultural research faculty, and a number of our objectives related to this goal. We sought to determine which were the most significant services the library can provide to researchers and whether enhanced services and easier access would change researchers' attitudes about use of information resources. Since many new services would require funding for continuation, it was also important to determine whether the services were significant enough that researchers would either pay for them directly or lobby to have funding provided through other sources.

In addition, our questionnaires would enable us to develop a clear profile of the researchers we serve. We assumed that patterns of information use would vary by discipline, level of experience or rank, and amount of time devoted to research. However, the data supplied in this report does not address these factors but rather the primary objectives of the study. We also wished to determine whether those individuals who used the services offered during the experimental period differed in significant ways from their colleagues.

METHODOLOGY

The various phases of the study took place over a twenty-two month period from April, 1983 to January, 1985. The following plan of action and timetable was implemented.

PLAN OF ACTION AND TIMETABLE

ACTION	TIMETABLE
LITERATURE REVIEW	APRIL - SEPTEMBER, 1983
QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT	SEPTEMBER - NOVEMBER, 1983
ADMINISTRATION OF FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE	DECEMBER, 1983
EXPERIMENTAL PERIOD OF ADDITIONAL AND FREE SERVICES	JANUARY - MAY, 1984
ADMINISTRATION OF SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE	MAY, 1984
ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS	JUNE - JANUARY, 1985
FINAL REPORT TO ARL	JANUARY, 1985

During the questionnaire development phase, we received extensive assistance from our methodology consultants. The first questionnaire went through numerous drafts and was pre-tested on a small group of faculty before the final revisions were made. Using a panel study technique, the first survey was sent to a random sample of 50% of the CALS faculty. The five-page (both sides) questionnaire was sent through the campus mail with a cover letter and return envelope. Each questionnaire was coded with a unique three digit number for record keeping purposes and for comparison of pre and post questionnaire responses. After one reminder to those who had not responded, we achieved a 79.4% rate of return. Out of the initial mailing of 231 surveys, seven were undeliverable. Of those questionnaires returned, 172 out of 178 were usable.

The post-questionnaire was developed in two versions: one that did not include demographic information was sent to those who responded to the pre-survey. The complete version was sent to those who received the initial survey but did not respond and to those who were not sent a first questionnaire. Out of a mailing of 463 questionnaires, we received 327 responses (70.6%) and of those, 323 were usable (69.8%). To achieve that response rate, we mailed out a follow-up letter and later another letter with a newly printed brightly colored questionnaire. A total of 134 individuals completed both the pre and post questionnaires.

In addition to responses to the questionnaires, data were gathered on the use of the services offered under the grant. In general, the services offered during the semester-long experimental period were designed to open up the variety of activities provided by the library and to make access more convenient by removing barriers to use. In some cases, the barrier that we removed was cost; a number of services we already offered were given free. In other cases, the service was a modification or expansion of something already offered or was entirely new.

Extensive consultations on research projects were offered to faculty. A reference librarian would prepare data and materials in support of a research project. Often online and hard-copy sources were searched and materials were retrieved, packaged, and delivered by library staff. Projects included the topics of amphibian metamorphosis, anerobic digestion, and milk marketing regulations. The staff had not been involved in projects of this type before.

Information services included free computer searches (with limits imposed as necessary on a case-by-case basis) and an expanded search schedule. Normally searches are provided on a full cost recovery basis. One project included assisting a faculty member set up a personal bibliographic file on Sci-Mate. Several large bibliography projects were begun, including one on agricultural extension and diffusion of information and a comprehensive bibliography of monographs on cheese. Librarians had not directly compiled bibliographies of that type for faculty before.

Two current awareness services that were already in place, distribution of tables of contents and automatic updating of computer searches (SDI's), were offered free during the semester.

Photocopy and document delivery services were expanded or made available free. One of the most popular new services enabled faculty to submit a

printout or list and library staff found call numbers, paged materials, and photocopied them. If desired, staff automatically filled out interlibrary loan forms to obtain materials not available on campus. Photocopy service was provided free (within limits negotiated individually) and small jobs were completed on-the-spot, a service not formerly offered. Faculty were given the option of having books and photocopies hand-delivered to their office or lab; no formal intra-campus library delivery system for faculty exists at Cornell. The restriction on the number of interlibrary loan requests that could be submitted each week was lifted, and non-traditional suppliers were used through DIALORDER for some requests.

The services available to faculty were publicized and promoted through various means. Before the initial survey was sent out, public service librarians met with department chairs or library liaisons to explain the research project and the services that would be offered on an experimental basis. The questionnaire itself sensitized 50% of the potential users to the upcoming services. Several faculty were ready with large projects on the first day expanded services were begun. Early in the semester, a letter was sent to all eligible faculty explaining the project and providing a list of services offered. A brief notice of the project which we inserted in the CALS Research Newsletter led to one of the few problems we had in the course of the study; several individuals who received the newsletter but were not in our eligible population vocally demanded free services.

In order to meet the heavy demand for services, some additional students were hired and some individuals' duties were reorganized. Forty additional hours of student help per week were split among Reference for retrieval of call numbers, Circulation for photocopy and document delivery, and Interlibrary Services to free other staff to provide additional borrowing. Since analysis of service needs is considered an integral part of the duties of the Head of Public Services, her time devoted to the project was not considered an extra responsibility. The Reference Unit has recently added a new position and half of that individual's time was used to coordinate the daily activities of the project. During the semester of expanded activities, we had a full reference staff of six professionals and one support staff. Two newly appointed reference librarians were scheduled heavily at the reference desk in order to free the time of three experienced librarians who performed the bulk of computer searching. All reference librarians and the Head of Public Services worked on special projects.

POST QUESTIONNAIRE DATA ANALYSIS

The questionnaires provided Mann Library with an interesting profile of its faculty users. Institutions that are interested in the findings of our study may want to compare the demographic characteristics of their institution with ours before accepting our conclusions as valid for their setting. Differences in percentages of individuals at a particular rank or with a particular level of research activity may influence the way in which the libraries are used.

Among our respondents, 50% came from the following departments out of the twenty-five surveyed: Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Economics, Agronomy, Entomology, Plant Pathology, Animal Science, and Education. Two of the departments, Agricultural Economics and Education, have a social science rather than a science emphasis. Many faculty in our population are at a senior level and have many years of experience; 42% were at the rank of Professor, 16% Associate Professor, and 22% Assistant Professor. Fully 35% had sixteen or more years of experience at Cornell while only 16% had one to three years of experience at Cornell.

As we anticipated, a heavy emphasis on research activities was indicated in the responses; 57% spend 40% or more of their time in research activities and 91% have conducted research in the past six months. Of the total amount of time spent on research activities, 32% spent 5% of their research time in the library and 35% spent 10% of their research time in the library. Our findings corroborated those of Busch and Lacy who found that agricultural faculty spent between 6-13% of their research time in the library (Busch and Lacy, 1983). The faculty use Mann Library more heavily for teaching purposes than for research; of time spent in the library, 69% use Mann 60-80% of the time for teaching purposes while only 15% use it 60-80% of the time for research. Respondents clearly indicated that Mann was their primary library on campus, 80% indicating they used the library five or more times during the past six months.

Another aspect which interested us about our users was how much they relied on others to do their library-related work. Many used graduate students and research assistants to perform library-related activities connected with the faculty's research project: 70% of their graduate student assistants used Mann five or more times in the past six months and 47% of their research assistants had a similar pattern. Secretaries were used much less frequently; only 7% performed five or more library-related activities in the past six months and 70% were not used at all for such work. The most frequent tasks given to assistants by faculty were locating materials on a given subject, retrieving specific documents, and photocopying materials. These figures indicate that both faculty themselves and their graduate or research assistants make use of the library.

As one of the primary emphases of this study, we wished to determine how the library fit into the process of scholarly communication. We addressed that issue by asking how our respondents keep current with relevant information in their field of study. They were given twenty-six choices, and the following is a ranked order listing by level of importance; the percentages indicate faculty responding either "very important" or "essential."

HOW FACULTY KEEP CURRENT IN THEIR FIELD

RANK	ACTIVITY	PERCENT
1	Reading journals in their field	88.1
2	Using their own collection of materials	70.2
3	Attending conferences or professional meetings	64.7
4	Correspondence and discussion with colleagues outside the university	64.6
5	Locating citations referenced in book and journal bibliographies	57.5
6	Correspondence and discussion with colleagues within the university	57.1
7	Consulting a known expert	47.1
8	Reading journals in related fields	45.6
9	Conducting online computer literature searches with a librarian	38.0
10	Scanning hardcopy indexes and abstracts	31.6
11	Scanning published announcements	31.2
12	Sending for preprints and reprints	30.6
13	Reading annual literature reviews	29.0
14	Referring to special bibliographies	27.4
15	Using ISI's Current Contents	25.4
16	Scanning issues in Mann's current periodical room	24.4
17	Running SDI's	24.1
18	Performing their own computer literature searches	19.2
19	Reading book reviews in journals	18.8
20	Communicating with reference librarians	17.8
21	Reading experiment station reports and research bulletins	16.8
22	Accessing data files	15.5
23	Reading farm and industry trade magazines	15.4
24	Using Mann's table of contents service	13.6
25	Looking in the library's card catalog	13.0
26	Browsing in bookstores	4.1

As anticipated, emphasis on personal contact (the invisible college) was strong and use of individuals' own collections was significant. Of those items rated essential or very important by 50% or more of the respondents, two items (reading journals and locating citations referenced in book and journal bibliographies) could be activities performed in the library. Ranking ninth and tenth were two activities strongly associated with the library: conducting online computer literature searches with a librarian and scanning hardcopy indexes and abstracts. Surprisingly, neither SDI's nor reading ISI Current Contents ranked high with a large percentage of this group. Awareness of new developments in information retrieval was indicated by the response of 19% of the faculty who considered performing their own computer literature searches to be essential or very important. The statistical analysis of the pre and post questionnaires revealed two significant changes in respondents' rankings of methods of keeping current. While our statistical consultant cautioned that these two changes might have been due to random factors, our experience with the grant and the exceptionally heavy use of online searching tends to validate these two tests. The items were conducting online computer searchs ($PR>|T|=0.07$) and running SDI's ($PR>|T|=0.02$).

Another primary emphasis of this study was to determine what services were most important to agricultural researchers in order to develop a model of appropriate library and information services. We asked the faculty to rate a list of twenty services according to their importance to their research information needs. The following is a listing in ranked order by level of importance; the percentages indicate faculty responding either "essential" or "very important."

FACULTY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF LIBRARY SERVICES

RANK	SERVICE	PERCENT
1	Checking out books and older journals	61.7
2	Ability to phone in, ask a question, and receive a quick, informative response	53.5
3	Having material photocopied immediately	52.3
4	Self-service photocopying	52.1
5	Availability of reference librarians for professional consultation	51.7
6	Availability of computer literature searches in the library on demand	51.4
7	Obtaining materials quickly from outside Cornell University	48.8
8	Using interlibrary loan without restriction on number of requests	38.6
9	Checking out journals published in the current year	37.4
10	Availability of automatic updates of computer searches (SDI's)	37.4
11	Ability to perform their own computer searches	35.7
12	Access to library holdings via office terminals or microcomputers	34.7
13	Accessibility to new formats of information (software, data files)	34.2
14	Receiving photocopies of tables of contents of journals	28.5
15	Access to other libraries' holdings via office terminals	26.6
16	Ability to give the library a list or printout, have the materials located and delivered	26.5
17	Delivery of Mann materials to their office	22.5
18	Access to personal computers in the library	21.9
19	Delivery of other campus library materials	20.2
20	Availability of computer searches performed in their office by a librarian	9.3

The highly ranked services reflect a mixture of traditional and more contemporary library services. Several of the highly rated services involve direct personal interaction with professional librarians or information staff: ability to benefit from telephone reference service, availability of reference consultations, and availability of computer searches by librarians. Photocopy and circulation services were clearly important to the researchers. One reason for the high importance of photocopying may be the researchers' reliance on their own collection of materials; what was originally part of the library's collection becomes

part of their own files. While Mann has a very strong collection in agriculture, researchers were still sensitive to the need to obtain materials unavailable on campus through other sources, quickly and without limitations. While our initial hypothesis was that barriers impeded use of some library/information services, our researchers were much less concerned about barriers to physical access than we had anticipated. Delivery of Mann or other campus library materials to researchers' offices or labs was not considered very important or essential by many, and availability of computer searches performed by a librarian in the researcher's office or lab was the lowest response.

Another question on the survey more directly addressed the issue of what barriers exist to faculty's use of library services. However, most responses strongly disagreed or disagreed with our proposed barriers to library use. In effect, they were indicating that there were few valid reasons for not using library resources or services. The only responses to which 30% or more agreed or strongly agreed were: dependence on their own collection of materials (52%), not having enough time (35%), and using a departmental library rather than Mann (31%). The following chart lists the percent of faculty who strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statements given.

FACULTY DISAGREE WITH THESE BARRIERS TO LIBRARY USE

STATEMENT	PERCENT
The library frequently doesn't own what I need.	68.8
What I need is usually not on the shelf or is checked out.	66.0
It's too much of a bother.	72.1
I depend on my own collection of materials.	35.8
Library staff isn't helpful.	91.6
The services offered don't meet my needs.	81.9
Response time to my requests is too long.	79.0
I don't have the time.	52.3
Library materials are out-of-date.	78.3
The services I need cost too much.	58.1
Other campus libraries are closer to my office.	83.0
I don't need to use the library.	90.7
Telephone reference service is not adequate.	48.3
The library isn't open when I need to use it.	76.6
It didn't occur to me to use the library.	87.7
I get enough information from other sources.	71.4
I use my departmental library.	61.0
My subject areas are better covered in other campus libraries.	67.5

Another component of our data analysis was the use of services offered under the grant program. Use was measured both by our own internal tallies and through questions answered on the survey. Our own data will be presented here since not all of those who used the services responded to the post questionnaire. Out of our total population of 463 researchers, 159 (34.3%) used one or more of the services during the experimental period. On the post questionnaire, sixty-two individuals responded that they had not been aware of the additional and free services that had been offered. The following chart indicates use of the services.

USE OF SERVICES DURING EXPERIMENTAL PERIOD

SERVICE	INDIVIDUALS SERVED	NUMBER
Special Projects/Research Consultations	12	15
Computer Searches	135	219
SDI's	27	27
Table of Contents Service	39	N/A
Photocopies	71	18,361
Delivery of Materials to Offices	17	N/A
ILL (Special Treatment)	12	55

Further analysis was made of two of the most popular services, computer searching and photocopying. Searches were performed for faculty in all twenty-five departments served (for a comparative period in spring, 1983 we performed searches for faculty in twenty of those departments). Seven departments accounted for 55% of the searching: Agronomy, Education, Agricultural Engineering, Entomology, Natural Resources, Ecology and Systematics, and Nutritional Sciences. As we became aware of how popular these searches were, we began to conduct a mini-survey at the time of the search appointment in order to determine the motivation of the researchers. We determined that prior to scheduling their search, 110 individuals were aware that they could have a free search under the terms of the grant; 17 were not. While 80 individuals said they signed up for the search because of the grant, 27 said that was not the case and 8 were not sure. We found that 68 would have had the search run even if it weren't free, 33 would not, and 26 were unsure. In some cases, we feel they may not have normally chosen to run the search at that time but might have at a different phase of their research.

Of the users served through the photocopy service, individuals in the following five departments accounted for 42% of all users: Natural Resources, Communication Arts, Agricultural Economics, Food Science, and Education. However, due to the large projects or repeated requests of some individuals, a different configuration of departments accounted for 43% of all photocopies made: Natural Resources, Ecology and Systematics, and Entomology. Several individuals used this opportunity to build large personal files, a highly regarded means of keeping current in their field. Most of the photocopy requests were received in person (60%), some by mail (31%), and a few by phone (9%). Researchers were given a choice of method of delivery, and 54% opted for campus mail, 33% picked up the copies in the library, 7% requested hand delivery to their offices, and 6% requested some other means. Users were asked to supply deadlines and only 17% requested same day service.

The post questionnaire included two items which related to researchers' satisfaction with the services. In both instances, responses were very positive. When asked how satisfied they had been with the quality of

services, 70% responded "very satisfied" while only 3% responded "somewhat dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied." When asked how satisfied they were with the timeliness of the service, 59% responded "very satisfied" and only 3% responded "somewhat dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied." Considering the intense use of the services during the experimental period, we felt these were very high levels of satisfaction.

Researchers were also asked how they would have funded such services or whether they would have used such services at all if they weren't free. They could indicate more than one option if applicable. The following summarizes their responses.

WHAT RESEARCHERS WOULD DO IF SERVICES WERE NOT FREE

RESPONSE	PERCENT
Would have paid with funds from their research budget	80.6
Would have scaled down their request	65.5
Would not have used the services	37.4
Would have had their department pay	18.2

In a separate question, researchers were asked who they thought should fund particular library services. The only case where 25% or more of the faculty felt the library should fund services was in the case of interlibrary loan; 50% felt the library should pay for obtaining materials quickly from sources outside Cornell and 56% felt the library should provide the funds to allow for unrestricted use of interlibrary loan. For many other services, using funds from their research budget was the favored method of paying for services.

WHO SHOULD FUND LIBRARY SERVICES

SERVICE	DEPARTMENT OR COLLEGE	LIBRARY	SELF	RESEARCH BUDGET
Photocopy	26.8	3.1	5.4	64.7
Campus Delivery of Materials	21.3	22.2	13.2	43.3
Computer Searches	23.3	14.7	1.9	60.1
Office Terminals to Access Library Holdings	75.6	5.8	3.1	15.5
Table of Contents Service	28.9	19.0	7.2	44.9
Interlibrary Loan	18.6	50.4	2.2	28.8
Ability to Give Library a List and Have Materials Located, Copied and Delivered	19.1	17.2	10.9	52.8

To determine if there was any correlation between a scientists' weighing of the importance of a library service (post questionnaire question #2) and their estimation of who should pay for those services (post questionnaire question #4), the chi square test was applied to a comparison between related items from these two questions. This test revealed that there was a statistically significant and clear preference of funding source for eight specific services. These items are:

Those scientists who rated self-service copying as very important or essential thought that their research budget should pay for it (P=0.04).

Most respondents considered hand delivery of Mann (P=0.0003) and other Cornell Libraries (P=0.0001) material to be an unnecessary service which, if needed, could be funded from their research budgets.

Access to Cornell University Library holdings via remote terminals is viewed as an important service which should be funded through the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and individual departments (P=0.006).

The ability to give the library a list and have the materials located and delivered to their office was an unimportant or somewhat important service which could be paid for through research funds (P=0.001).

Many researchers felt that the provision of photocopies from journal tables of contents was a relatively unimportant service which could be funded by their research budgets. Those individuals who did view the service as important indicated two sources of funding - the library and their research budget (P=0.0001).

Obtaining materials quickly from sources external to Cornell (P=0.0319) and use of interlibrary service without restrictions (P=0.003) were considered important or essential services which should be directly funded and supported by the library.

EVALUATION OF RESULTS

The survey did enable us to identify the most significant services for agricultural researchers and has already had major implications for directions in Mann Library. We feel confident in planning to continue to implement many of the enhanced services offered under the grant since our researchers have indicated that in many cases they are willing to fund them through their research budget or other means.

We did not succeed in proving our hypothesis that if services were made more convenient and accessible, researchers would change their use of information resources. While our data showed few statistically significant changes as a result of the experimental period of services, our methodology consultants had cautioned us at the outset that it would be very difficult to produce significant changes in such a short time frame. In addition, our statistical consultant advised that since many responses were so favorable towards the library and its services, it would be difficult to elicit much change.

However, in the case of a number of individual researchers, we found that the experimental period did provide the impetus for change in their use of information resources. The following comments are from the post questionnaire.

"The additional services made a big difference in my utilization of the library. I went more often and obtained more information more quickly."

"The free services allowed me to try a different approach to literature searches that I would not otherwise have considered. It was successful enough that I would request money for it in future research funds."

"I think the service was excellent and my productivity was enhanced because of it."

"The initiative on the part of library personnel has caused me to 'update' my library usage. The spring project helped me to break out of card catalog, book and journal retrieval pattern, to see much richer possibilities for research."

We found that in our milieu the important barriers we removed were not necessarily barriers to physical access or convenience per se but rather barriers to the accessibility of information. In a complex information environment, researchers will use information resources more if well-trained intermediaries are available. Most faculty do not want to be left on their own, as they generally are in academic libraries. They appreciate and value the skills of the library staff and are more satisfied if the staff directly provides more services, as in a special library.

The survey results and the personal experience of the staff enabled us to construct the following model of services for agricultural research faculty.

MODEL OF SERVICES

REFERENCE/CONSULTATION SERVICES

CHARACTERISTICS:
- Librarians are available for personal consultation on extensive research projects.
- Librarians directly assist in compilation of bibliographies for research projects.
- Telephone reference/information service is readily available.

COMPUTER-RELATED SERVICES

CHARACTERISTICS:
- Librarians are readily available to perform computer searches.
- An instructional program is implemented for faculty who wish to do their own searches.
- An instructional program is implemented for faculty who wish to learn to use file management packages to organize their personal collections of materials.
- Non-bibliographic data files are added to the library collection and appropriate staff is available to assist with their use.

DOCUMENT DELIVERY SERVICES

CHARACTERISTICS:
- No number limit is placed on researchers' requests for materials not available on campus.
- The most expeditious means are used to obtain materials not available on campus.
- Researchers can give the library a list or printout and have materials located, copied, and delivered.

CIRCULATION SERVICES

CHARACTERISTICS: Efficient circulation services are available.
Journals are available for circulation on a limited basis.

PHOTOCOPY SERVICES

CHARACTERISTICS: Both self-service and staff-operated services are available.
On-the-spot staff service is available.

CURRENT AWARENESS SERVICES

CHARACTERISTICS: SDI's are readily available.
Tailored table of contents service is available.
Needs of particular departments are studied.

This model implies that librarians take a more pro-active role in information dissemination and provision of services. Close consultation with faculty working on research projects and development of appropriate current awareness techniques for faculty are important components of the model. As information technology changes and as both researchers and librarians become more sophisticated in their use of information resources, there will, no doubt, be changes in the model.

At Mann Library, the experience of providing services during the grant period and the analysis of the survey data have led to a number of changes in public services, and more changes are anticipated. When we studied the list of services rated "essential" or "very important" by our researchers, we decided to implement as best as possible those items desired by at least 25% of our users. Since individual faculty have different priorities and needs we feel that it is important to offer a broad range of services in order to satisfy our clientele.

Reviewing the highly rated services as ranked in the chart, some of the plans and changes at Mann will be described here, generally in the order indicated on the chart. We feel that changes made in circulation policy approximately one year before the grant resulted in strong faculty satisfaction with the top-rated service of checking out books and older journals. Quick telephone reference service is readily available at Mann but not heavily used. The survey indicated strong interest in this service but lack of awareness of the parameters of its use. In one of the responses, 44.1% indicated that they were uncertain whether telephone reference service is adequate. We have targeted this service for promotion. Photocopy service has received a great deal of attention. Equipment has been upgraded to provide less frustrating self-service photocopying, and the staff-run photocopying on demand has continued. Public service librarians have continued to provide extensive consultations to researchers, and the ties between librarians and faculty are being strengthened through implementation of a collection development/liaison model. Mann has continued its strong tradition of providing high quality computer searches, and the hours on the search schedule have been increased to accommodate the demand. In addition, we are holding workshops for faculty who wish to conduct their own computer searches or who want to use bibliographic file management packages to manage their personal files of materials.

While the grant services were being offered, we became more interested in non-library suppliers of documents, i.e. Chemical Abstracts Service and companies such as Information on Demand. As a result we applied for and received a grant from the Council on Library Resources to study library and commercial document suppliers. We hope to be able to offer more efficient and cost-effective document delivery services as a result. We have also continued the lifting of the restriction on the number of items that could be requested through interlibrary loan.

We have also consolidated the responsibility for some services under the rubric of Current Awareness Services. The ARL Project Director has assumed responsibility for better marketing of such services as SDI's, table of contents service, and providing document delivery when given a list of items. He will also begin to study the specialized needs of particular departments.

As a consequence of a year-long planning effort, Cornell hopes to implement an automated, integrated library system in the near future. This will enable faculty to access library holdings via their office terminal or microcomputer. The specifications also call for the ability to access network holdings.

In a new area of information services, Mann has hired a Data Services Librarian who will acquire non-bibliographic files and software packages. She will also promote their use and serve as a consultant to researchers.

The services that we will not implement as a result of the grant are a campus document delivery system or the availability of librarians to routinely perform searches in faculty offices. While Mann does have an operational Microcomputer Center, it is primarily used by undergraduate and graduate students. We felt that faculty did not rate this service highly since if they needed to use a microcomputer as an integral part of their research, they would have their own hardware.

The thinking that went into the preparation of this project, the actual experience of greater interaction with our researchers, and the analysis of the survey results have assisted in the improvement of services at Mann. We hope that other libraries, particularly ARL land-grant institutions, will be able to benefit from the results of our research.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Several areas of concern would provide valuable follow-ups to our study. In order to determine whether the preponderance of senior level faculty at Cornell and our particular mix of agriculture departments skewed our results, an institution with a different population could replicate our study. We expect to do further analysis here of variation by department. We also plan to study in greater detail by department what sources are most valuable for current awareness.

We felt that some researchers may not have used our services because the grant did not come at an appropriate time in their research process. It would be useful to study the effect of where researchers are in their thinking and activities as it relates to stages where use of library services is most effective. Such a study would help librarians target their promotional efforts to appropriate times.

Finally, at the outset of our study we stated that we were not planning to determine whether the use of library resources affected the quality of the research product. While this would be very difficult to measure, such a study would be a valuable contribution to agriculture and to librarianship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Busch, Lawrence and William B. Lacy. Science, Agriculture, and the Politics of Research. Boulder: Westview Press, 1983.

Butler, Meredith and Bonnie Gratch. "Planning a User Study - The Process Defined." College and Research Libraries 43 (July, 1982) 320-30.

Chen, Ching-Chih. "How Do Scientists Meet Their Information Needs?" Special Libraries 65 (July, 1974) 272-80.

Dillman, Don A. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York; Wiley, 1978.

Dougherty, Richard M. and Laura L. Blomquist. Improving Access to Library Resources. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Drake, Miriam. "Information Management and Special Librarianship." Special Libraries 73 (October, 1982) 225-237.

Evans, Susan M. and Maurice B. Line. "A Personalized Service to Academic Researchers." Journal of Librarianship 5 (July, 1973) 214-32.

Gautschi, David A. User Survey for the Cornell University Libraries: Final Report. July, 1980.

Holladay, Janice W. "The Role of an Academic Librarian in the Information Age." Special Libraries 73 (October, 1982) 266-269.

Horton, Forest W. "The Emerging Information Counselor." ASIS Bulletin 8 (June, 1982) 16-19.

Matheson, Nina. "Academic Information in the Academic Health Science Center: Roles for the Library in Information Management." Journal of Medical Education 57 (October, 1982) Part 2 (Supplement) 1-93.

Payne, Stanley L. The Art of Asking Questions. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951.

Russell, H.M. "Agricultural User Populations and Their Information Needs in the Industrialized World." IAALD Quarterly Bulletin 28 (no. 2, 1982) 40-52.

User Surveys and Evaluation of Library Services (SPEC kit 71). Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1981.

Weisberg, Herbert F. and Bruce D. Bowen. An Introduction to Survey Research and Data Analysis. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1977. DATA ANALYSIS

APPENDIX

I. QUESTIONNAIRES

A. PREQUESTIONNAIRE

1. Cover letter A-1
2. Responses ..... A-2 - A-9

B. POSTQUESTIONNAIRE

1. Cover letter A A-10
2. Cover letter B A-11
3. First follow-up letter A-12
4. Second follow-up letter
   a. version A A-13
   b. version B A-14
5. Responses ..... A-15 - A-24

II. PUBLICITY AND ADVERTISING

A. Announcement in Research Newsletter A-25

B. Letter to Eligible Faculty ..... A-26 - A-27

C. Form response to non-eligible faculty A-28

III. RECORD KEEPING

A. Request for Document Delivery A-29

B. Citation Summary Sheet A-30

C. Special Request Form A-31

D. COMPASS Form for Additional Information .. A-32

IV. BUDGET A-33

I. QUESTIONNAIRES

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Statutory Colleges of the State University, at Cornell University

PLEASE ADDRESS
Albert R. Mann Library
Ithaca, New York 14853

December 5, 1983

To:

From: Jan Olsen, Director

Subject: Enclosed questionnaire

As a researcher in the College of Agriculture, you are probably aware of the proliferation of information in all formats. Locating and obtaining the information and the publications you need for your research may be a time-consuming and sometimes frustrating activity. The Albert R. Mann Library has received a grant from the Association of Research Libraries to study the current use of information resources by agricultural faculty. If library services were made more convenient and accessible, we hypothesize that faculty would change their information resource use pattern. To that end, we are surveying faculty use and opinion of information resources and services and then will be offering expanded reference and document delivery services on a trial basis during spring semester. Subsequently, we will use a follow-up survey to determine whether the expanded services changed use of library resources. A model of the kinds of information services required by an agricultural research faculty will be developed.

Your name was drawn in a random sample of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences faculty. In order for the results to represent accurately the activities and opinions of the CALS faculty, it is important that you complete this questionnaire and return it to me by Tuesday, December 13, 1983.

Your answers will be kept confidential. Each questionnaire contains an identification number for mailing purposes and for correlation with the post-questionnaire. Names will <u>not</u> be placed on the questionnaire, and results of the study will be published in such a way that answers by any one person cannot be identified. We hope to disseminate the results of this study to the agricultural and research library communities.

If you have any questions about this project or questionnaire, please contact my associate Bill Coons (6-7731). Your answers to this questionnaire are vital. With your cooperation, we can fulfill the goal of our grant, "to encourage quality research into service issues facing staff and users in research libraries so that librarians can use the results to increase the effectiveness of their services". Please return your questionnaire by Tuesday, December 13; an addressed campus envelope is enclosed. Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
Cornell University

INFORMATION RESOURCES IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

The purpose of this survey is to gather data which will guide major changes in services to faculty within the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

Your answers will be essential in determining ways to expand and improve library services for you and the other agricultural research scientists of the College. Your participation in this survey is crucial in helping us determine accurately the needs of researchers in the many disciplines of the College.

The questionnaire will take only 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Please return it by Tuesday, December 13, 1983 to Jan Olsen, Director, Mann Library.

1. How important for you are the following sources and methods for keeping current with relevant information in your field of study? (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How important is each source or method? (circle your answers)				
		UNIMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ESSENTIAL
169	a. Attending conferences or professional meetings	1 (3.6)	2 (7.1)	3 (26.0)	4 (32.5)	5 (30.8)
155	b. Scanning published announcements	1 (8.4)	2 (29.7)	3 (38.1)	4 (16.8)	5 (7.0)
168	c. Reading journals in your field	1 (0)	2 (1.2)	3 (4.2)	4 (23.8)	5 (70.8)
169	d. Reading journals in related fields ..	1 (3.0)	2 (14.8)	3 (33.1)	4 (35.5)	5 (13.6)
170	e. Reading experiment station reports and research bulletins	1 (29.4)	2 (28.2)	3 (24.1)	4 (13.0)	5 (5.3)
169	f. Browsing in bookstores	1 (49.1)	2 (30.8)	3 (13.6)	4 (6.5)	5 (0)
168	g. Looking in the library's card catalog	1 (29.8)	2 (33.9)	3 (22.6)	4 (10.1)	5 (3.6)
170	h. Consulting a known expert	1 (4.7)	2 (18.2)	3 (29.4)	4 (32.9)	5 (14.8)
169	i. Correspondence and discussion with colleagues within Cornell University.	1 (1.8)	2 (12.4)	3 (33.7)	4 38.5)	5 (13.6)
169	j. Correspondence and discussion with colleagues outside Cornell University	1 (0.6)	2 (7.7)	3 (30.8)	4 (46.1)	5 (14.8)
168	k. Using your own collection of materials .	1 (0.6)	2 (5.9)	3 (23.2)	4 (40.5)	5 (29.8)
166	l. Accessing data files (such as census)	1 (38.6)	2 (29.5)	3 (19.9)	4 (8.4)	5 (3.6)
167	m. Communicating with reference librarians	1 (20.4)	2 (44.9)	3 (21.6)	4 (9.6)	5 (3.5)
170	n. Scanning hardcopy indexes & abstracts	1 (10.6)	2 (35.3)	3 (30.6)	4 (15.9)	5 (7.6)
169	o. Referring to special bibliographies..	1 (13.0)	2 (31.4)	3 (33.7)	4 (14.2)	5 (7.7)
168	p. Conducting online computer literature searches with a librarian	1 (21.4)	2 (28.6)	3 (22.6)	4 (16.1)	5 (11.3)
164	q. Performing your own computer literature searches	1 (45.1)	2 (27.4)	3 (14.1)	4 (8.5)	5 (4.9)
166	r. Running SDI's (automatic updates of previous computer searches)	1 (45.8)	2 (28.3)	3 (11.4)	4 (11.4)	5 (3.1)
170	s. Reading book reviews in journals	1 (16.5)	2 (33.5)	3 (31.2)	4 (15.9)	5 (2.9)
168	t. Sending for preprints and reprints ..	1 (17.9)	2 (18.4)	3 (31.5)	4 (18.4)	5 (13.8)
166	u. Locating citations referenced in book and journal article bibliographies ..	1 (4.2)	2 (10.2)	3 (22.3)	4 (37.4)	5 (25.9)
159	v. Using Mann's table of contents service	1 (53.5)	2 (20.1)	3 (11.3)	4 (13.8)	5 (1.3)
165	w. Using ISI's Current Contents	1 (38.2)	2 (20.0)	3 (13.3)	4 (12.7)	5 (15.8)
170	x. Reading annual literature reviews ...	1 (21.2)	2 (25.9)	3 (24.1)	4 (21.2)	5 (7.6)
170	y. Reading farm & industry/trade magazines	1 (48.8)	2 (24.7)	3 (14.7)	4 (7.7)	5 (4.1)
168	z. Scanning journal titles and issues in Mann's current periodicals room	1 (28.6)	2 (23.8)	3 (24.4)	4 (11.9)	5 (11.3)
14	Other (explain) _____	1 (0)	2 (7.1)	3 (21.4)	4 (28.6)	5 (42.9)

2. The following is a list of current or proposed library services. Evaluate the importance or potential importance of these services according to your research information needs. (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How important are these library services? (circle your answer) UNIMPORTANT / SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT / IMPORTANT / VERY IMPORTANT / ESSENTIAL
167	a. Having material photocopied immediately	1 (7.8) 2 (16.8) 3 (21.0) 4 (33.0) 5 (21.4)
166	b. Self-service photocopying	1 (9.0) 2 (14.4) 3 (22.3) 4 (30.1) 5 (24.2)
166	c. Checking out of the library journals published in the current year	1 (17.5) 2 (20.5) 3 (19.9) 4 (27.7) 5 (14.4)
168	d. Checking out books & older journals....	1 (4.8) 2 (9.5) 3 (17.9) 4 (32.1) 5 (35.7)
167	e. Delivery of Mann library materials to your office or lab upon request	1 (46.1) 2 (22.1) 3 (13.8) 4 (12.6) 5 (5.4)
167	f. Delivery of materials from other campus libraries to your office or lab	1 (40.7) 2 (25.7) 3 (14.4) 4 (15.0) 5 (4.2)
169	g. Availability of computer literature searches in the library on demand	1 (11.2) 2 (18.9) 3 (20.7) 4 (30.8) 5 (18.4)
164	h. Availability of computer literature searches performed in your office by a librarian	1 (50.6) 2 (21.3) 3 (13.4) 4 (10.9) 5 (3.8)
167	i. Ability to perform your own computer literature searches	1 (27.5) 2 (20.4) 3 (16.8) 4 (21.5) 5 (13.8)
165	j. Availability of automatic updates of previous computer searches (SDI's)	1 (24.2) 2 (27.9) 3 (18.2) 4 (20.0) 5 (9.7)
165	k. Ability to phone in, ask a question, & receive a quick informative response ..	1 (12.1) 2 (12.1) 3 (30.9) 4 (24.3) 5 (20.6)
167	l. Receiving photocopies of the tables of contents of current journals	1 (31.1) 2 (18.6) 3 (16.8) 4 (24.5) 5 (9.0)
166	m. Obtaining materials quickly from sources outside Cornell University	1 (5.4) 2 (16.3) 3 (26.5) 4 (39.8) 5 (12.0)
167	n. Using interlibrary loan without restrictions on number of requests	1 (21.6) 2 (20.9) 3 (21.6) 4 (26.3) 5 (9.6)
167	o. Ability to give the library a list or printout & have the materials located & delivered to your office or lab	1 (40.7) 2 (19.2) 3 (19.8) 4 (14.9) 5 (5.4)
164	p. Accessibility to new formats of information (software libraries, data files)	1 (17.7) 2 (18.9) 3 (34.1) 4 (22.6) 5 (6.7)
167	q. Availability of reference librarians for professional consultation	1 (5.4) 2 (20.9) 3 (28.1) 4 (27.6) 5 (18.0)
166	r. Access to Cornell University library holdings via office or departmental terminals or microcomputers	1 (20.5) 2 (22.3) 3 (16.3) 4 (25.3) 5 (15.6)
165	s. Access to other major research libraries' holdings via office/department terminals	1 (25.5) 2 (24.2) 3 (20.0) 4 (19.4) 5 (10.9)
157	t. Access to IBM Personal Computers via the Microcomputer Lab	1 (42.0) 2 (21.0) 3 (16.6) 4 (14.7) 5 (5.7)

3. What other services would you like to see available in Mann Library?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. A list of nine specialized services is presented in rows a to i. Who do you think should fund each service? Please identify the most appropriate funding source by checking one box for each of the nine specialized services.

No. Responding		Who should fund each service? (check one box for each of the services in rows a to i)				My Research Budget	
		My Department	The Library	CALS	Myself	direct	over-head
158	a. Having material photocopied immediately	28.5	1.9	3.2	6.3	50.6	9.5
158	b. Delivery of Mann Library materials to your office or lab on request..	12.0	18.3	15.2	20.9	26.0	7.6
156	c. Delivery of materials from other campus libraries to your office or lab upon request	13.5	21.8	12.8	17.9	26.3	7.7
156	d. Having computer literature searches done	13.5	17.9	5.8	2.6	52.6	7.6
154	e. Having terminals in your office or department for checking the holdings of the Cornell University Libraries	51.9	5.9	26.0	1.9	13.6	0.7
153	f. Receiving photocopies of the tables of contents of current journals	16.3	21.6	6.5	8.5	39.2	7.9
157	g. Obtaining materials quickly from sources outside Cornell	5.1	49.0	15.9	2.6	24.2	3.2
154	h. Using interlibrary loan without restrictions on requests	5.2	55.8	16.9	1.3	16.9	3.9
151	i. Ability to give the library a list and have the materials located and delivered to your office or lab...	13.3	18.5	11.9	14.6	35.1	6.6

PREQUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

5. Have you conducted research within the past SIX months? (circle a or b)

a. NO — 13 or 7.8% → GO TO QUESTION 10

b. YES — 152 or 91.6% → GO TO QUESTION 6

.6% error in reading

6. Consider the time you devote to research activities. During the last SIX months, approximately what percent of your research time did you spend:

	No. Responding	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100
a. in the office?	A.	32.2	28.3	21.0	13.9	4.6
b. in the library?	B.	93.1	4.1	2.1	0.7	0
c. in your home?	C.	84.0	12.0	4.0	0	0
d. in the laboratory?	D.	47.9	22.5	16.3	12.2	1.1
e. in the computing facility?	E.	93.9	4.0	2.1	0	0
f. in the greenhouse?	F.	100	0	0	0	0
g. in the field?	G.	59.7	24.7	11.7	2.6	1.3
h. elsewhere (specify) _____	H.	69.2	23.1	7.7	0	0

7. Within the past SIX months how often have you (or members of your staff on your behalf) used the services of these Cornell University Libraries for your research purposes? (please circle one response for each item)

No. Resonding		How often have these libraries been used in the past six months? (circle your answer)
133	a. Entomology Library (Comstock)	NONE(79.7) ONCE (6.8) 2-5 TIMES (3.0) 5+ (10.5)
138	b. Engineering Library (Carpenter) ..	NONE(64.5) ONCE (10.9) 2-5 TIMES (15.9) 5+ (8.7)
129	c. Undergraduate Library (Uris)	NONE(72.1) ONCE (11.6) 2-5 TIMES (13.2) 5+ (3.1)
128	d. ILR Library (Catherwood)	NONE(89.1) ONCE (4.7) 2-5 TIMES (6.2) 5+ (0)
130	e. Physical Sciences Library (Clark)	NONE(62.3) ONCE (9.2) 2-5 TIMES (15.4) 5+ (13.2)
158	f. Mann Library	NONE(1.3) ONCE (4.4) 2-5 TIMES (17.1) 5+ (77.2)
127	g. Management Library (BPA - Malott)	NONE(76.4) ONCE (7.8) 2-5 TIMES (12.6) 5+ (3.2)
136	h. Veterinary Library (Flower)	NONE(55.1) ONCE (11.8) 2-5 TIMES (17.6) 5+ (15.5)
143	i. Olin Library (Graduate)	NONE(49.6) ONCE (7.7) 2-5 TIMES (20.3) 5+ (22.4)
85	j. Departmental (identify) _____	NONE(36.1) ONCE (4.6) 2-5 TIMES (22.3) 5+ (37.0)
69	k. Other (identify) _____	NONE(52.2) ONCE (7.2) 2-5 TIMES (10.1) 5+ (30.5)

8. How often have you or the following people associated with your research used Mann Library within the past SIX months? (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How often has Mann Library been used for your research by these people? (circle your answer)
156	a. Yourself	NONE 3.8 ONCE 6.4 2-5 TIMES 19.9 5+ 69.9
105	b. Post-doctoral Fellows	NONE 58.1 ONCE 0 2-5 TIMES 6.7 5+ 35.2
135	c. Graduate Students	NONE 16.3 ONCE 0.7 2-5 TIMES 7.4 5+ 75.6
117	d. Research Assistants	NONE 40.2 ONCE 0.8 2-5 TIMES 13.7 5+ 45.3
43	e. Technicians	NONE 44.2 ONCE 4.4 2-5 TIMES 22.1 5+ 29.3
111	f. Secretaries	NONE 72.1 ONCE 7.2 2-5 TIMES 13.5 5+ 7.2
108	g. Undergraduate Students	NONE 40.7 ONCE 1.0 2-5 TIMES 15.7 5+ 42.6
38	h. Other (specify) _____	NONE 94.7 ONCE 0 2-5 TIMES 0 5+ 5.3

9. What kinds of library activities have your associates (b to h in the previous question) completed for you in the past SIX months? (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How often has Mann Library been used for these specific library activities? (circle your answer)
141	a. Locating materials on a given subject	NONE 12.1 ONCE 7.8 2-5 TIMES 23.4 5+ 56.7
125	b. Searching for incomplete citations (bibliographic verification)	NONE 34.4 ONCE 6.4 2-5 TIMES 36.8 5+ 22.4
32	c. Retrieving specific documents	NONE 15.9 ONCE 3.8 2-5 TIMES 25.8 5+ 54.5
133	d. Photocopying materials	NONE 18.8 ONCE 8.3 2-5 TIMES 24.1 5+ 48.8
27	e. Serving as a go-between for computer searches in the library	NONE 59.8 ONCE 15.7 2-5 TIMES 21.3 5+ 3.2
32	f. Other (explain) _____	NONE 87.5 ONCE 3.1 2-5 TIMES 3.1 5+ 6.3

10. Please describe your expectations of a major academic research library. What do you see as Mann's role? How should Mann Library fit into your research needs?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. A few of the reasons why people do not use libraries are listed below. Which of these reasons apply to you and your experiences with Mann Library? Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with these statements. (circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How strongly do you agree or disagree? (circle your answer)				
		STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	UNCERTAIN	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
168	a. The library frequently doesn't own what I need	1(33.9)	2(33.9)	3(5.9)	4(18.0)	5 (8.3)
166	b. What I need is usually not on the shelf or is checked out	1(16.3)	2(42.2)	3(19.9)	4(18.6)	5 (3.0)
164	c. It's too much of a bother	1(43.3)	2(34.1)	3(8.5)	4(11.0)	5 (3.1)
166	d. I depend on my own collection of materials	1(18.1)	2(21.1)	3(9.0)	4(37.9)	5 (13.9)
163	e. Library staff isn't helpful	1(62.0)	2(31.9)	3(5.5)	4(0.6)	5 (0)
165	f. The services offered don't meet my needs	1(39.4)	2(37.6)	3(14.5)	4(7.3)	5 (1.2)
164	g. Response time to my requests is too long	1(34.8)	2(43.9)	3(15.2)	4(4.9)	5 (1.2)
163	h. I don't have the time	1(31.3)	2(23.3)	3(12.9)	4(23.9)	5 (8.6)
165	i. Library materials are out-of-date	1(40.6)	2(34.5)	3(12.1)	4(10.9)	5 (1.9)
163	j. The services I need cost too much	1(27.6)	2(35.6)	3(25.2)	4(8.6)	5 (3.0)
164	k. Other campus libraries are closer to my office	1(57.3)	2(25.6)	3(3.0)	4(10.4)	5 (3.7)
165	l. I don't need to use the library	1(76.4)	2(15.8)	3(2.4)	4(4.2)	5 (1.2)
154	m. Telephone reference service is not adequate	1(25.3)	2(24.7)	3(44.8)	4(4.6)	5 (0.6)
164	n. The library isn't open when I need to use it	1(36.0)	2(39.6)	3(7.9)	4(13.4)	5 (3.1)
165	o. It didn't occur to me to use the library	1(67.3)	2(25.5)	3(3.6)	4(3.6)	5 (0)
164	p. I get enough information from other sources	1(42.7)	2(27.4)	3(9.8)	4(17.7)	5 (2.4)
159	q. I use my departmental library	1(42.8)	2(20.1)	3(5.0)	4(23.9)	5 (8.2)
164	r. My subject areas are better covered in other campus libraries	1(40.2)	2(26.8)	3(9.2)	4(15.9)	5 (7.9)
10	s. Other (identify) _____	1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4(30)	5 (70)

12. How many professional journals do you personally receive? (circle your answer).

No. Responding	Percent	
7	4.1	a. NONE
64	37.6	b. ONE TO THREE
79	46.5	c. FOUR TO SIX
20	11.8	d. SEVEN OR MORE
	100	

13. Your position or title is: (circle your answer)

No. Responding	Percent	
71	41.8	a. Professor
28	16.5	b. Associate Professor
37	21.8	c. Assistant Professor
8	4.7	d. Senior Research Associate
15	8.8	e. Research Associate
3	1.7	f. Senior Lecturer
7	4.1	g. Lecturer
1	.6	h. other (identify) _____.

14. How many years of teaching or research experience have you had at Cornell University? (circle your answer)

No. Responding	Percent	
7	4.1	a. LESS THAN ONE
27	15.9	b. ONE TO THREE
35	20.7	c. FOUR TO SEVEN
39	23.1	d. EIGHT TO FIFTEEN
60	35.5	e. SIXTEEN OR MORE

15. What department are you in? 51% of the respondents were from the departments of Agric. Engineering, Agric.Economics, Agronomy, Entomology, Plant Pathology, Animal Science and Education.

16. What is your best estimate of the actual time you spent in the following activities during the past SIX months? (you may use comparative percentages from your effort distribution report). The total for a through e should tally to 100%.

0-2	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100	
13.9	29.1	29.1	13.3	14.6	a. _____% Research
29.5	36.7	22.2	5.8	5.7	b. _____% Teaching
61.8	17.1	14.5	5.2	1.4	c. _____% Extension
77.3	6.7	9.7	5.3	1.0	d. _____% Administration
89.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	0	e. _____% other (explain) _____.
					100 %

17. If you can differentiate between your use of Mann Library for teaching and research purposes, please do so by indicating the percentages below:

	0-20%	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100
Research	47.5	23.0	14.7	9.0	5.8
Teaching	5.3	7.3	18.0	25.4	44

-- THANK YOU -- Please return this questionnaire by Dec. 13

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Statutory Colleges of the State University, at Cornell University

PLEASE ADDRESS
Albert R. Mann Library
Ithaca, New York 14853

May 2, 1984

To: CALS Faculty, Ithaca

From: Jan Olsen, Director

Subject: Enclosed questionnaire

As a researcher in the College of Agriculture, you are probably aware of the proliferation of information in all formats. Locating and obtaining the information and the publications you need for your research may be a time-consuming and sometimes frustrating activity. The Albert R. Mann Library received a grant from the Association of Research Libraries to study the current use of information resources by agricultural faculty. If library services were made more convenient and accessible, we hypothesized that faculty would change their information resource use pattern. To that end, we implemented free and additional reference and document delivery services on a trial basis during spring semester. We had an excellent response to these services and now need to determine exactly how effective and important they are. The enclosed survey will be used to determine how you see the library's role in the research process and whether the expanded services changed your use of library resources. A model of the kinds of information services required by an agricultural research faculty will be developed.

We are surveying the Ithaca faculty of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Please complete this questionnaire even if you did not use our services during this semester.

Your answers will be kept confidential. Each questionnaire contains an identification number for mailing purposes. Names will <u>not</u> be placed on the questionnaire, and results of the study will be published in such a way that answers by any one person cannot be identified. We hope to disseminate the results of this study to the agricultural and research library communities.

If you have any questions about this project or questionnaire, please contact my associate Bill Coons (6-7731). Your answers to this questionnaire are vital. Please return your questionnaire in the enclosed addressed campus envelope by Friday, May 11. Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

JKO/sy
encl.

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Statutory Colleges of the State University, at Cornell University

PLEASE ADDRESS
Albert R. Mann Library
Ithaca, New York 14853

May 2, 1984

To: CALS Faculty, Ithaca

From: Jan Olsen

Subject: Enclosed questionnaire

In December, 1983, you were among the faculty in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences who helped us to achieve an excellent response rate to our questionnaire "Information Resources in Agricultural Research." We are once again asking for your cooperation in filling out a similar survey instrument.

During this semester, we have been offering free and expanded library services to a selected population of which you were a member. We have had an excellent response to these services and now need to determine exactly how effective and important you found them.

The enclosed questionnaire will be used to establish how you perceive the library's role in the research process and whether the availability of expanded services changed your use of library resources. The repetition of some questions from the initial survey is intentional since we seek to measure change. Please complete this questionnaire even if you did not use our services this semester.

Your answers will be kept confidential. Each questionnaire contains an indentification number for mailing purposes and for correlation with the earlier questionnaire. Names will not be placed on the questionnaire, and results of the study will be published in such a way that answers by any one person cannot be identified. We hope to disseminate the results of this study to the agricultural and research library communities.

If you have any questions about this project or questionnaire, contact my associate Bill Coons (6-7731). Please return your questionnaire in the enclosed addressed campus envelope by Friday, May 11. Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

JKO/sy
encl.

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Statutory Colleges of the State University, at Cornell University

PLEASE ADDRESS
Albert R. Mann Library
Ithaca, New York 14853

May 10, 1984

To: CALS Faculty, Ithaca

From: Jan Olsen, Director

Subject: Return of questionnaire

Last week you received a questionnaire on information resources in agricultural research.

In the wake of the rather ferocious flow of memoranda from Mann Library, I am embarrassed to be writing to you again. However, we badly need a higher level of response to ensure the accuracy of the survey.

If you have completed the questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, I would be most grateful if you would take a few minutes to complete it. As you know, your answers to the questionnaire will be kept confidential and the results of the study will be published in such a way that answers by any one person cannot be identified.

I hope that the data we gather will enable us to provide you with more useful library service.

JKO/sy

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Statutory Colleges of the State University, at Cornell University

PLEASE ADDRESS
Albert R. Mann Library
Ithaca, New York 14853

21 June 84

TO: CALS Faculty, Ithaca

FROM: Jan Olsen, Director

SUBJECT: Questionnaire Return

In May you received a questionnaire on information resources in agricultural research. To date, we have received a response from only 50% of those surveyed. We need a higher rate of return to ensure the accuracy of the survey.

If our other correspondence to you did not reach you or has been lost, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. Would you please take some time to complete it?

Your contribution is greatly appreciated.

NOTE: As a faculty member who used these services, we would be particularly interested in your response. Please complete the questionnaire if you have not already done so.

JO:SR

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Statutory Colleges of the State University, at Cornell University

PLEASE ADDRESS
Albert R. Mann Library
Ithaca, New York 14853

21 June 84

TO: CALS Faculty, Ithaca

FROM: Jan Olsen, Director

SUBJECT: Questionnaire Return

In May you received a questionnaire on information resources in agricultural research. To date, we have received a response from only 50% of those surveyed. We need a higher rate of return to ensure the accuracy of the survey.

If our other correspondence to you did not reach you or has been lost, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. Would you please take some time to complete it?

Your contribution is greatly appreciated.

JO:SR

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
Cornell University

INFORMATION RESOURCES IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

The purpose of this survey is to gather data which will guide major changes in services to faculty within the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

Your answers will be essential in determining ways to expand and improve library services for you and the other agricultural research scientists of the College. Your participation in this survey is crucial in helping us determine accurately the needs of researchers in the many disciplines of the College.

The questionnaire will take only 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Please return it by Friday, May 11, 1984 to Jan Olsen, Director, Mann Library.

1. How important for you are the following sources and methods for keeping current with relevant information in your field of study? (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How important is each source or method? (circle your answers)				
		UNIMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ESSENTIAL
292	a. Attending conferences or professional meetings	1 (3.8)	2 (11.6)	3 (19.9)	4 (35.3)	5 (29.4)
270	b. Scanning published announcements	1 (10.7)	2 (27.4)	3 (30.7)	4 (21.5)	5 (9.7)
293	c. Reading journals in your field	1 (0)	2 (2.0)	3 (9.9)	4 (22.5)	5 (65.6)
291	d. Reading journals in related fields ..	1 (2.1)	2 (17.9)	3 (34.4)	4 (32.3)	5 (13.3)
292	e. Reading experiment station reports and research bulletins	1 (30.8)	2 (31.2)	3 (21.2)	4 (13.0)	5 (3.8)
291	f. Browsing in bookstores	1 (48.8)	2 (28.9)	3 (18.2)	4 (3.4)	5 (0.7)
291	g. Looking in the library's card catalog	1 (30.3)	2 (38.1)	3 (18.6)	4 (9.6)	5 (3.4)
293	h. Consulting a known expert	1 (3.1)	2 (16.7)	3 (33.1)	4 (32.4)	5 (14.7)
294	i. Correspondence and discussion with colleagues within Cornell University.	1 (1.4)	2 (12.6)	3 (28.9)	4 (38.4)	5 (18.7)
294	j. Correspondence and discussion with colleagues outside Cornell University	1 (1.0)	2 (9.9)	3 (24.5)	4 (41.1)	5 (23.5)
291	k. Using your own collection of materials	1 (0.3)	2 (8.2)	3 (21.3)	4 (35.1)	5 (35.1)
290	l. Accessing data files (such as census)	1 (35.2)	2 (28.3)	3 (21.0)	4 (11.4)	5 (4.1)
292	m. Communicating with reference librarians	1 (17.1)	2 (40.4)	3 (24.7)	4 (13.7)	5 (4.1)
289	n. Scanning hardcopy indexes & abstracts	1 (13.1)	2 (29.4)	3 (25.9)	4 (22.2)	5 (9.4)
288	o. Referring to special bibliographies..	1 (16.0)	2 (26.0)	3 (30.6)	4 (18.7)	5 (8.7)
292	p. Conducting online computer literature searches with a librarian	1 (16.1)	2 (23.3)	3 (22.6)	4 (26.4)	5 (11.6)
282	q. Performing your own computer literature searches	1 (38.3)	2 (24.8)	3 (17.7)	4 (12.4)	5 (6.8)
274	r. Running SDI's (automatic updates of previous computer searches)	1 (37.6)	2 (21.2)	3 (17.1)	4 (16.4)	5 (7.7)
292	s. Reading book reviews in journals	1 (17.8)	2 (33.6)	3 (29.8)	4 (15.1)	5 (3.7)
288	t. Sending for preprints and reprints ..	1 (19.4)	2 (26.0)	3 (24.0)	4 (17.4)	5 (13.2)
290	u. Locating citations referenced in book and journal article bibliographies ..	1 (4.2)	2 (8.6)	3 (29.7)	4 (28.6)	5 (28.9)
273	v. Using Mann's table of contents service	1 (45.8)	2 (24.9)	3 (15.7)	4 (9.9)	5 (3.4)
279	w. Using ISI's Current Contents	1 (36.6)	2 (24.4)	3 (13.6)	4 (11.4)	5 (14.0)
287	x. Reading annual literature reviews ...	1 (18.1)	2 (27.5)	3 (25.4)	4 (20.0)	5 (9.0)
293	y. Reading farm & industry/trade magazines	1 (50.5)	2 (21.8)	3 (12.3)	4 (11.0)	5 (4.4)
290	z. Scanning journal titles and issues in Mann's current periodicals room	1 (28.3)	2 (26.6)	3 (20.7)	4 (14.1)	5 (10.3)
14	Other (explain) _____	1 (0)	2 (7.1)	3 (35.7)	4 (28.6)	5 (28.6)

2. The following is a list of current or proposed library services. Evaluate the importance or potential importance of these services according to your research information needs. (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How important are these library services? (circle your answer)				
		UNIMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ESSENTIAL
291	a. Having material photocopied immediately	1(7.2)	2 (14.4)	3(26.1)	4 (33.7)	5 (18.6)
292	b. Self-service photocopying	1(7.5)	2 (14.0)	3(26.4)	4 (29.5)	5 (22.6)
291	c. Checking out of the library journals published in the current year	1(14.8)	2 (18.2)	3(29.6)	4 (24.0)	5 (13.4)
290	d. Checking out books & older journals....	1(1.7)	2 (7.6)	3(29.0)	4 (28.3)	5 (33.4)
293	e. Delivery of Mann library materials to your office or lab upon request	1(36.9)	2 (22.5)	3(18.1)	4 (17.0)	5 (5.5)
293	f. Delivery of materials from other campus libraries to your office or lab	1(38.9)	2 (23.5)	3(17.4)	4 (15.0)	5 (5.2)
292	g. Availability of computer literature searches in the library on demand	1(8.2)	2 (12.3)	3(28.1)	4 (31.5)	5 (19.9)
288	h. Availability of computer literature searches performed in your office by a librarian	1(53.1)	2 (22.6)	3(15.0)	4 (8.7)	5 (0.6)
289	i. Ability to perform your own computer literature searches	1(20.4)	2 (19.7)	3(24.2)	4 (24.2)	5 (11.5)
286	j. Availability of automatic updates of previous computer searches (SDI's)	1(19.6)	2 (21.0)	3(22.0)	4 (24.8)	5 (12.6)
290	k. Ability to phone in, ask a question, & receive a quick informative response ..	1(13.1)	2 (14.1)	3(19.3)	4 (28.3)	5 (25.2)
292	l. Receiving photocopies of the tables of contents of current journals	1(29.4)	2 (17.1)	3(25.0)	4 (20.9)	5 (7.6)
293	m. Obtaining materials quickly from sources outside Cornell University	1(9.2)	2 (17.1)	3(24.9)	4 (34.5)	5 (14.3)
293	n. Using interlibrary loan without restrictions on number of requests	1(18.4)	2 (20.8)	3(22.2)	4 (26.6)	5 (12.0)
291	o. Ability to give the library a list or printout & have the materials located & delivered to your office or lab	1(28.5)	2 (22.0)	3(23.0)	4 (17.9)	5 (8.6)
281	p. Accessibility to new formats of information (software libraries, data files)	1(13.5)	2 (22.8)	3(29.5)	4 (24.6)	5 (9.6)
292	q. Availability of reference librarians for professional consultation	1(4.1)	2 (17.5)	3(26.7)	4 (30.5)	5 (21.2)
286	r. Access to Cornell University library holdings via office or departmental terminals or microcomputers	1(18.2)	2 (18.2)	3(26.2)	4 (27.3)	5 (10.1)
286	s. Access to other major research libraries' holdings via office/department terminals	1(24.8)	2 (20.3)	3(28.3)	4 (18.2)	5 (8.4)
278	t. Access to IBM Personal Computers via the Microcomputer Lab	1(37.4)	2 (22.0)	3(18.7)	4 (17.6)	5 (4.3)

3. What other services would you like to see available in Mann Library?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

4. A list of nine specialized services is presented in rows a to i. Who do you think should fund each service? Please identify the most appropriate funding source by checking one box for each of the nine specialized services.

No. Responding		Who should fund each service? (check one box for each of the services in rows a to i)				My Research Budget	
		My Department	The Library	CALS	Myself	direct	over-head
261	a. Having material photocopied immediately	23.0	3.1	3.8	5.4	50.2	14.5
257	b. Delivery of Mann Library materials to your office or lab on request..	8.5	22.2	12.8	13.2	33.5	9.8
258	c. Delivery of materials from other campus libraries to your office or lab upon request	10.8	18.6	13.6	12.4	32.6	12.0
265	d. Having computer literature searches done	10.9	14.7	12.4	1.9	49.1	11.0
258	e. Having terminals in your office or department for checking the holdings of the Cornell University Libraries	43.8	5.8	31.8	3.1	12.8	2.7
252	f. Receiving photocopies of the tables of contents of current journals	19.0	19.0	9.9	7.2	36.5	8.4
268	g. Obtaining materials quickly from sources outside Cornell	5.9	50.4	12.7	2.2	21.3	7.5
259	h. Using interlibrary loan without restrictions on requests	3.9	56.0	13.1	1.5	18.5	7.0
256	i. Ability to give the library a list and have the materials located and delivered to your office or lab...	7.8	17.2	11.3	10.9	41.8	11.0

5. : Have you conducted research within the past SIX months? (circle a or b)

a. NO — 25 or 8.5% → GO TO QUESTION 10

b. YES — 267 or 91.1% → GO TO QUESTION 6

.4% error in coding

6.. Consider the time you devote to research activities. During the last SIX months, approximately what percent of your research time did you spend:

No. Responding			0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
259	a. in the office?.....	A	19.3	28.2	30.4	16.3	5.8
243	b. in the library?.....	B	93.4	5.4	0.7	0.5	0
184	c. in your home?.....	C	75.0	15.3	8.1	1.1	.5
164	d. in the laboratory?.....	D	51.2	28.7	14.0	5.5	.6
87	e. in the computing facility?	E	93.1	5.7	1.2	0	0
37	f. in the greenhouse?.....	F	81.1	16.2	2.7	0	0
119	g. in the field?.....	G	65.5	21.1	12.5	.9	0
16	h. elsewhere (specify) _____	H	81.3	18.7	0	0	0

7. Within the past SIX months how often have you (or members of your staff on your behalf) used the services of these Cornell University Libraries for your research purposes? (please circle one response for each item)

No. Responding		How often have these libraries been used in the past six months? (circle your answer)									
222	a. Entomology Library (Comstock)	NONE	81.5	ONCE	5.9	2-5 TIMES	4.5	5+	8.
227	b. Engineering Library (Carpenter) ..	NONE	67.4	ONCE	9.7	2-5 TIMES	16.3	5+	6.6
223	c. Undergraduate Library (Uris)	NONE	75.8	ONCE	9.4	2-5 TIMES	13.0	5+	1.8
225	d. ILR Library (Catherwood)	NONE	88.9	ONCE	5.3	2-5 TIMES	5.3	5+	.5
233	e. Physical Sciences Library (Clark)	NONE	62.2	ONCE	11.2	2-5 TIMES	17.6	5+	9.0
268	f. Mann Library	NONE	0.4	ONCE	0.7	2-5 TIMES	19.0	5+	79.9
224	g. Management Library (BPA - Malott)	NONE	77.2	ONCE	8.0	2-5 TIMES	10.3	5+	4.5
228	h. Veterinary Library (Flower)	NONE	64.0	ONCE	10.1	2-5 TIMES	11.9	5+	14.0
237	i. Olin Library (Graduate)	NONE	48.1	ONCE	13.1	2-5 TIMES	22.8	5+	16.0
129	j. Departmental (identify) _____	NONE	38.8	ONCE	2.4	2-5 TIMES	22.0	5+	36.8
96	k. Other (identify) _____	NONE	66.7	ONCE	5.2	2-5 TIMES	11.5	5+	16.6

8. How often have you or the following people associated with your research used Mann Library within the past SIX months? (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How often has Mann Library been used for your research by these people? (circle your answer)
261	a. Yourself	NONE 4.5 ONCE 2.7 2-5 TIMES 25.8 5+ 67.0
172	b. Post-doctoral Fellows	NONE 60.5 ONCE 0.6 2-5 TIMES 6.9 5+ 32.0
240	c. Graduate Students	NONE 15.0 ONCE 0.4 2-5 TIMES 15.0 5+ 69.6
182	d. Research Assistants	NONE 33.5 ONCE 1.1 2-5 TIMES 18.7 5+ 46.7
198	e. Technicians	NONE 48.0 ONCE 4.0 2-5 TIMES 23.7 5+ 24.3
191	f. Secretaries	NONE 69.9 ONCE 7.3 2-5 TIMES 16.3 5+ 6.8
197	g. Undergraduate Students	NONE 41.2 ONCE 1.1 2-5 TIMES 13.9 5+ 43.8
60	h. Other (specify) _____	NONE 83.3 ONCE 0 2-5 TIMES 6.7 5+ 10.0

9. What kinds of library activities have your associates (b to h in the previous question) completed for you in the past SIX months? (please circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How often has Mann Library been used for these specific library activities? (circle your answer)
247	a. Locating materials on a given subject	NONE 10.1 ONCE 3.6 2-5 TIMES 32.0 5+ 54.3
219	b. Searching for incomplete citations (bibliographic verification)	NONE 45.2 ONCE 9.6 2-5 TIMES 29.7 5+ 15.5
242	c. Retrieving specific documents	NONE 16.9 ONCE 6.2 2-5 TIMES 31.4 5+ 45.5
237	d. Photocopying materials	NONE 23.6 ONCE 4.2 2-5 TIMES 27.0 5+ 45.2
217	e. Serving as a go-between for computer searches in the library	NONE 58.1 ONCE 15.7 2-5 TIMES 22.1 5+ 4.1
55	f. Other (explain) _____	NONE 85.5 ONCE 1.8 2-5 TIMES 1.8 5+ 10.9

10. Please describe your expectations of a major academic research library. What do you see as Mann's role? How should Mann Library fit into your research needs?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. A few of the reasons why people do not use libraries are listed below. Which of these reasons apply to you and your experiences with Mann Library? Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with these statements. (circle one response for each item).

No. Responding		How strongly do you agree or disagree? (circle your answer)									
		STRONGLY DISAGREE		DISAGREE		UNCERTAIN		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE	
285	a. The library frequently doesn't own what I need	1	34.4	2	34.4	3	5.6	4	21.8	5	3.8
282	b. What I need is usually not on the shelf or is checked out	1	14.9	2	51.1	3	17.0	4	16.3	5	0.7
280	c. It's too much of a bother	1	41.4	2	30.7	3	13.6	4	12.5	5	1.8
279	d. I depend on my own collection of materials	1	12.9	2	22.9	3	12.2	4	39.8	5	12.2
283	e. Library staff isn't helpful	1	63.3	2	28.3	3	7.4	4	0.7	5	0.3
282	f. The services offered don't meet my needs	1	35.1	2	46.8	3	12.8	4	4.6	5	0.7
281	g. Response time to my requests is too long	1	29.2	2	49.8	3	14.2	4	6.4	5	0.4
279	h. I don't have the time	1	26.5	2	25.8	3	12.9	4	28.3	5	6.5
277	i. Library materials are out-of-date	1	39.3	2	39.0	3	11.9	4	8.7	5	1.1
279	j. The services I need cost too much	1	25.1	2	33.0	3	24.4	4	14.7	5	2.8
281	k. Other campus libraries are closer to my office	1	55.2	2	27.8	3	5.0	4	8.1	5	3.9
280	l. I don't need to use the library	1	73.2	2	17.5	3	3.6	4	4.3	5	1.4
261	m. Telephone reference service is not adequate	1	23.0	2	25.3	3	44.1	4	6.5	5	1.1
282	n. The library isn't open when I need to use it	1	37.6	2	39.0	3	7.4	4	14.9	5	1.1
278	o. It didn't occur to me to use the library	1	67.0	2	22.7	3	4.3	4	4.3	5	0.7
280	p. I get enough information from other sources	1	38.9	2	32.5	3	9.6	4	17.2	5	1.8
274	q. I use my departmental library	1	38.0	2	23.0	3	7.6	4	25.9	5	5.5
280	r. My subject areas are better covered in other campus libraries	1	42.9	2	24.6	3	11.4	4	15.7	5	5.4
17	s. Other (identify) _____	1	23.5	2	0	3	17.7	4	29.4	5	29.4

12. Were you aware of the additional and free services offered by Mann Library under the ARL grant during spring semester, 1984? (circle a or b)

292 or 78.8% — a. NO → Go to question 20 — 62 or 21.2%

Go to question 13 ← b. YES

13. How did you find out about the additional and free services offered by Mann Library? (circle "Yes" or "No" as appropriate)

No. Responding							
160	a.	CALS Research Newsletter	40.0	NO	YES	60
157	b.	Faculty library liaison	59.2	NO	YES	40.8
200	c.	Letter of eligibility from the library	13.5	NO	YES	86.5
151	d.	Librarian speaking at faculty meeting	68.9	NO	YES	31.1
140	e.	When requesting library service	87.1	NO	YES	12.9
151	f.	Word-of-mouth from colleagues	66.2	NO	YES	33.8
43	g.	Other (specify)_____	90.7	NO	YES	9.3
51	h.	Don't remember	84.3	NO	YES	15.7

14. Did you use any of the additional or free services offered by Mann Library during spring semester, 1984? (circle a or b)

Go to question 15 ← a. NO

85 or 36.8% — b. YES → Go to question 16 — 146 or 63.2%

15. Why didn't you use any of the additional or free services?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

— GO TO QUESTION 20 —

16. What additional or free services did you use? (circle "Yes" or "No" as appropriate)

No. Responding			Percentages			
122	a.	free photocopies	NO	41	YES	59
115	b.	hand-delivery of materials to office or lab.	NO	74	YES	26
139	c.	computer searches (COMPASS)	NO	14.4	YES	85.6
113	d.	automatic updating of computer searches (SDI's)	NO	87.6	YES	12.4
118	e.	providing photocopies of articles identified through a computer search	NO	52.5	YES	47.5
117	f.	photocopies of tables of contents of journals	NO	75.2	YES	24.8
114	g.	providing photocopies of articles identified through the table of contents service	NO	84.2	YES	15.8
114	h.	special projects	NO	84.2	YES	15.8

17. If you had not received these services free, how would you have funded them? (circle "Yes" or "No" as appropriate)

No. Responding						
123	a.	I wouldn't have used the services	62.6	NO	YES	37.4
119	b.	I would have scaled down my request for information	34.5	NO	YES	65.5
110	c.	I would have my department pay for it	81.8	NO	YES	18.2
134	d.	I would have paid for it with funds from my research budget	19.4	NO	YES	80.6
24	e.	Other (please explain)_____	66.7	NO	YES	33.3

18. How satisfied were you with the quality of the service? (circle one response)

No. Responding			
101	a.	Very satisfied	69.7
39	b.	Generally satisfied	26.9
1	c.	Neutral	0.7
3	d.	Somewhat dissatisfied	2.0
1	e.	Very dissatisfied	0.7

19. How satisfied were you with the timeliness of the service? (circle one response)

No. Responding			
85	a.	Very satisfied	59.0
51	b.	Generally satisfied	35.4
4	c.	Neutral	2.8
2	d.	Somewhat dissatisfied	1.4
2	e.	Very dissatisfied	1.4

Please add additional comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

POSTQUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE NOT AVAILABLE FOR THESE QUESTIONS

20. How many professional journals do you personally receive? (circle your answer).

a. NONE
b. ONE TO THREE
c. FOUR TO SIX
d. SEVEN OR MORE

21. Your position or title is: (circle your answer)

a. Professor
b. Associate Professor
c. Assistant Professor
d. Senior Research Associate
e. Research Associate
f. Senior Lecturer
g. Lecturer
h. other (identify) _____.

22. How many years of teaching or research experience have you had at Cornell University? (circle your answer)

a. LESS THAN ONE
b. ONE TO THREE
c. FOUR TO SEVEN
d. EIGHT TO FIFTEEN
e. SIXTEEN OR MORE

23. What department are you in? _____.

24. What is your best estimate of the actual time you spent in the following activities during the past SIX months? (you may use comparative percentages from your effort distribution report). The total for a through e should tally to 100%.

a. _____% Research
b. _____% Teaching
c. _____% Extension
d. _____% Administration
e. _____% other (explain) _____.

100 %

25. If you can differentiate between your use of Mann Library for teaching and research purposes, please do so by indicating the percentages below:

The percentage of my use of Mann Library for research is _____%.
The percentage of my use of Mann Library for teaching is _____%.

100 %

-- THANK YOU -- Please return this questionnaire by May 11

II. PUBLICITY AND ADVERTISING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RESEARCH NEWSLETTER

Volume III, Number 3 January 25, 1984

Mann Library will Offer Special Support for CALS Researchers. A grant to study the use of information resources by agriculture faculty has been awarded to Mann Library by the Association of Research Libraries. As part of the study, library resources and services will be made more convenient and accessible to all CALS faculty during Spring Semester. Traditional and expanded information retrieval and document delivery services, ranging from photocopying and citation verification to computer literature searches and the compilation of bibliographies, will be offered to CALS faculty -- without charge. Large projects will be individually negotiated and some limits will prevail. Graduate students and post-docs may not participate in this project. To become involved with Mann's research project and to take advantage of these services, call 6-7731 and ask how Mann Library can help you with your research information needs. Please identify yourself as a CALS faculty member. (3-A)

The Hudson River Foundation has announced its 1984 solicitation of proposals for research in the following subject areas: organism and population biology; biological production and cycling of materials; physical, chemical, and geological processes; the influence of major physical, chemical, and geological factors on ecosystems dynamics; structure and dynamics of the biotic community; interactions between the terrestrial and aquatic portions of the ecosystem; and environmental monitoring. The Foundation also "seeks to develop information related to social, economic, scientific, and public policy matters through research and education."

Awards for single or multiple year research grants and for conferences and symposia are available. Nineteen projects ranging in budget from $7,500 to $61,500 were funded in 1983. Deadlines for receipt of proposals are February 23 or August 30, 1984. Further information on the program and the application forms are available in the Office for Research through Ms. Pat Oplinger (6-4521). (3-B)

The National Science Foundation has announced the winners of Visiting Professorships for Women, a recently established grant program which will allow 32 women up to two years of research time at major universities. Finalists were chosen on the basis of the quality of their research proposals. The purpose of the program is to give "visibility" to women in science. "Visibility" includes the amount of teaching and seminars a woman proposes to do during the grant period. Also considered is perhaps becoming the first woman in the department she visits. Margarete S. Klein, director of the program, said the idea is to promote good research opportunities for women and role models for women considering science as a career. (3-C)

The Division of Research Resources of the National Institutes of Health is continuing its competitive Biomedical Research Support Shared Instrumentation Grant Program. The objective of the program is to make available to institutions with a high concentration of NIH supported biomedical investigators, research instruments which can only be justified on a shared-use basis. Eligible institutions may submit more than one application for different instrumentation in the FY 1985 review cycle which has an application receipt date of February 15, 1984.

(3-D)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Statutory Colleges of the State University, at Cornell University

PLEASE ADDRESS
Albert R. Mann Library
Ithaca, New York 14853

March 5, 1984

Dear CALS faculty member:

I would like to take this opportunity to alert you to an experimental project underway at Mann Library. The Albert R. Mann Library has received a grant from the Association of Research Libraries to study the current use of information resources by agricultural faculty. As a researcher in the College of Agriculture, you are probably aware of the proliferation of information in all formats. Locating and obtaining the information and the publications you need for your research may be a time-consuming and sometimes frustrating activity. If library services were made more convenient and accessible, we hypothesize that faculty would change their information resource use pattern.

To that end, we are conducting a limited experiment with a selected population of researchers from the College of Agriculture faculty on the Ithaca campus. We have already surveyed faculty use and opinion of information resources and services and are now offering expanded reference and document delivery services on an experimental basis during spring semester. Subsequently, we will use a follow-up survey to determine whether the expanded services changed use of library resources. A model of the kinds of information services required by an agricultural research faculty will be developed.

You will find enclosed a more detailed description of the nature and scope of the project. By receiving this letter, you are designated as one of the CALS faculty eligible for the services offered.

We encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity. Please think creatively about how the library staff may be able to meet your information needs. We will be happy to discuss any project you have in mind.

Sincerely,

Jan Olsen

Jan Olsen
Director

JKO/sy
encl.

Experimental Information Services for Agricultural Research Faculty

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) has awarded the Albert R. Mann Library funds to conduct a study relating to the use of information resources by agriculture faculty. The purpose of the study is to determine the role of information resources in research, to evaluate the use and non-use of various resources and services and to develop a model of information resource use.

WHAT ARE THE SERVICES?

Mann Library is offering new or expanded services on a trial basis to faculty from selected departments within CALS on the Ithaca campus. Convenience, accessibility and reliability are the overriding concerns for this study.

Examples of the services offered are:

1) Information retrieval — free computer searches and photocopies of relevant materials identified through the search.
2) Current awareness—
   a) Automatic updating of computer searches
   b) Photocopies, free of charge, of tables of contents from Mann journals as they are received.
3) Document delivery — photocopies and Mann books delivered to your office or laboratory.
4) Consultations — assistance with literature reviews, compilation of bibliographies, provision of factual or statistical information.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

Since this is an experimental study it is necessary to work with a controlled population. Only CALS faculty from selected departments on the Ithaca campus are eligible for these special services this semester.

WHAT IS THE TIMEFRAME?

The grant and the services offered will run through 1 May 84. Requests received after that date will not be processed.

WHAT ARE THE LIMITATIONS?

The standards for services offered under the ARL Grant are:

a) Eligibility. (Note: Requests for services in a faculty's name for a graduate student will not be honored.)

b) Generally broad, very frequent or extremely costly computer literature searches will not be fully subsidized.

c) Large projects will be individually negotiated.

HOW DO YOU PARTICIPATE?

To become involved with Mann's research project and to take advantage of these services call 6-7731, walk in to the Reference Desk, or send a request through campus mail. Please address Mann Library Information Services and mention the ARL Grant. Direct your comments or questions to Bill Coons, Reference Librarian or Joan Lippincott, Head of Public Services.

To: Cornell Community

From: Jan Olsen, Director, Mann Library

Thank you for inquiring about the expanded services we are offering under an ARL Grant. Albert R. Mann Library has been awarded a research grant by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) to conduct a study "Appropriate Public Services for Agricultural Research Faculty." For spring semester, 1984, the library is implementing new or expanded services on a trial basis. Since this is an experimental study, it was necessary for us to work with a controlled population. Only CALS faculty from selected departments on the Ithaca campus are eligible for these special services this semester. At the end of the semester, we will survey these CALS faculty to determine which services were most important and gather opinions on how we should continue to fund these services for all library users.

If you are not among those served by the grant, we would still be interested in your suggestions on what new or expanded services you would like to see the library offer. Please direct your comments to Bill Coons, Reference Librarian or Joan Lippincott, Head of Public Services, Mann Library (6-7731).

JO/cv

III. RECORD KEEPING

FORM 'A'

ARL REQUEST FOR DOCUMENT DELIVERY SERVICES: ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY: CODE NO. _____

REQUESTOR: _____ (name must appear on ARL List of Eligible Faculty)

Department: _____ Campus Address: _____ Phone: _____

REQUEST:

1. Obtain _____(no.) books. ID Number: _____
2. Obtain photocopies of _____(no.) articles

REQUESTED ITEMS NEEDED:

A. Today by _____(time) (use blue rush clip)

B. Tomorrow by _____(time)

C. By _____(date and time)

METHOD OF DELIVERY:

A. Campus Mail

B. Hand-delivery to office or lab

C. Requestor will pick up items at Circulation Desk

If items requested are not at Cornell, does requestor want Mann to obtain them from other sources?

_____YES _____NO

If items are at Cornell but cannot be retrieved, does requestor want Mann to:

1. Place a recall (it takes a week)
2. Request a search (unless item is quickly found it takes a year)
3. Obtain it from another source (one to four weeks)
4. Indicate to requestor that the item wasn't copied.

Request taken on _____(date) at _____(time) by _____(initials)

Request received via: ____in person
__ __phone
____mail

WHEN REQUEST COMPLETED RETURN THIS FORM TO REFERENCE. ←

Request Completed: _____(date)
_____(time)
Number of books loaned: _____
Number of pages copied: _____

FORM 'B'

CITATION SUMMARY SHEET FOR ARL DOCUMENT DELIVERY REQUESTS: ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY

REQUESTOR: _____ DATE: _____ PHONE: _____

Location & Call Number

Author(s) _____

Name of book or journal _____

_____

Title of article or chapter _____

_____

Date _____ Volume _____ Issue _____ Pages _____ to _____

OTHER INFORMATION _____

Location & Call Number

Author(s) _____

Name of book or journal _____

_____

Title of article or chapter _____

_____

Date _____ Volume _____ Issue _____ Pages _____ to _____

OTHER INFORMATION _____

Location & Call Number

Author(s) _____

Name of book or journal _____

_____

Title of article or chapter _____

_____

Date _____ Volume _____ Issue _____ Pages _____ to _____

OTHER INFORMATION _____

Location & Call Number

Author(s) _____

Name of book or journal _____

_____

Title of article or chapter _____

_____

Date _____ Volume _____ Issue _____ Pages _____ to _____

OTHER INFORMATION _____

ARL SPECIAL REQUEST

REQUESTOR: _____ DEPT: _____ CAMPUS: _____

REQUEST Rcvd: _____ (date) by _____ (initials) via [__ person __ phone __ mail]

TOPIC:

MATERIAL NEEDED BY:

day _____

date _____

time _____

NOTES:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACTION TAKEN:

- ____ request acknowledged
- ____ Compass
- ____ search in hdey indexes + ref. sources
- ____ card catalog search
- ____ special bibliography prepared
- ____ consultation with requestor
- ____ photocopies mailed (provided)
- ____ writing or phoning to (for) sources outside Cornell
- ____ book delivered
- ____ other (list): _____

A-31

Librarian working on search: _____ DATE: _____ (ALL WORK ON THIS REQUEST COMPLETED)

ROUGH ESTIMATE OF TIME SPENT ON REQUEST: _____.

ALBERT R. MANN LIBRARY

ARL GRANT
COMPASS

Patrons Name _____

Search Date _____

1. Was patron aware of the ARL Grant prior to scheduling the search?

_____yes _____ no, searcher explained it.

2. If YES, did patron sign up for the search because of the ARL Grant?

_____yes _____ no _____ not sure

3. Would patron have done the search if it were not free?

_____ yes _____ no _____maybe

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

END

DEPT. OF EDUCATION

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

JULY

29_ 1985